



Australian Government

**Australian Institute of
Health and Welfare**

*Better information and statistics
for better health and wellbeing*

Counting the homeless 2006

Tasmania

June 2009

Chris Chamberlain

Director

Centre for Applied Social Research

RMIT University

David MacKenzie

Associate Professor

Institute for Social Research

Swinburne University

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Canberra

Cat. no. HOU 208

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare is Australia's national health and welfare statistics and information agency. The Institute's mission is *better information and statistics for better health and wellbeing*.

© Commonwealth of Australia 2009

This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Commonwealth. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney General's Department, Robert Garran Offices, National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600 or posted at <http://www.ag.gov.au/cca>

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry

Author: Chamberlain, Chris, 1948–

Title: Counting the homeless 2006: Tasmania / Chris Chamberlain, David MacKenzie.

ISBN: 9781740249188 (pbk.)

Notes: Bibliography.

Subjects: Homeless persons--Tasmania--Statistics.

Homelessness--Tasmania.

Homelessness--Policy.

Other Authors/Contributors:

MacKenzie, David, 1949–

Dewey Number: 305.569209946

Suggested citation

Chamberlain C, MacKenzie D 2009. Counting the homeless 2006: Tasmania. Cat. no. HOU 208. Canberra: AIHW.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Board Chair Hon. Peter Collins, AM, QC

Director Penny Allbon

Published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Printed by Bluestar Print Group

Please note that there is the potential for minor revisions of data in this report. Please check the online version at <www.aihw.gov.au> for any amendments.

CONTENTS

Preface.....	3
Executive Summary	5
Introduction.....	11
1 Definition of Homelessness.....	13
2 Overcounting and Undercounting.....	17
3 Social Characteristics.....	25
4 Geographical Distribution.....	33
5 Indigenous and non-Indigenous	47
6 Discussion.....	49
References	57
Appendix 1	60
Appendix 2	61
Appendix 3	62
Appendix 4	63



Publications

Chris Chamberlain and David MacKenzie (2008) *Counting the Homeless 2006*, Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue No. 2050.0.

David Mackenzie and Chris Chamberlain (2008) *Youth Homelessness in Australia 2006*, Melbourne: Counting the Homeless 2006 project.

Publications: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare

Counting the Homeless 2006: New South Wales

Counting the Homeless 2006: Victoria

Counting the Homeless 2006: Queensland

Counting the Homeless 2006: Western Australia

Counting the Homeless 2006: South Australia

Counting the Homeless 2006: Tasmania

Counting the Homeless 2006: Australian Capital Territory

Counting the Homeless 2006: Northern Territory

Inquiries

Chris Chamberlain: 03 9925 2956 or chris.chamberlain@rmit.edu.au

David MacKenzie: 03 9386 2909 or djmack@optusnet.com.au

PREFACE

Counting the Homeless began as a research project with the Australian Bureau of Statistics, producing one report on the national homeless population in 1996. It has since developed into a cooperatively produced national data collection, involving the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), and RMIT and Swinburne Universities. A national report was published by the ABS in September 2008, and for the first time the state and territory reports are published by the AIHW.

Funding for *Counting the Homeless 2006* was provided by the Community and Disability Services Ministers' Advisory Council and the Housing Ministerial Advisory Committee and coordinated by the Australian Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA). We are grateful to senior officers in FaHCSIA and the various state and territory departments which have facilitated this large and complex project at all stages.

The ABS has been a key partner from the outset and provided excellent in-kind support under its Australian Census Analytic Program. We thank our colleagues in the ABS for their continuing commitment to the project and for their generous advice and assistance, as well as their dedicated work in response to our many data requests.

Important supplementary information for the analysis comes from the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) National Data Collection at the AIHW. The AIHW team responded quickly to our inquiries. We have greatly appreciated their interest and support.

Hundreds of people in schools, local council services and homeless agencies have assisted us during the school census and especially during the extensive national local area fieldwork. Their local knowledge has been an invaluable input to this report.

The Council to Homeless Persons (CHP), Homelessness Australia, the National Youth Coalition for Housing (NYCH) and the Women's Services Network (WESNET) have been strong supporters of the project from the beginning and we have greatly appreciated their encouragement. Finally, we thank our editor, Estelle Tang, who provided invaluable editorial assistance.

Chris Chamberlain

David MacKenzie

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 DEFINITION OF HOMELESSNESS

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) uses the cultural definition of homelessness to enumerate the homeless population on census night (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 1992). This definition distinguishes between people in primary, secondary and tertiary homelessness.

Primary homelessness describes the situation of all people without conventional accommodation, such as people living on the streets, sleeping in parks, squatting in derelict buildings, living in improvised dwellings (such as sheds, garages or cabins), and using cars or railway carriages for temporary shelter.

Secondary homelessness describes the situation of people who move frequently from one form of temporary shelter to another. On census night, all people staying in emergency or transitional accommodation provided under the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) are considered part of this category. Secondary homelessness also includes people residing temporarily with other households because they have no accommodation of their own, and people staying in boarding houses on a short-term basis, operationally defined as 12 weeks or less.

Tertiary homelessness describes the situation of people who live in boarding houses on a medium to long-term basis, operationally defined as 13 weeks or longer. Residents of private boarding houses are homeless because their accommodation does not have the characteristics identified in the minimum community standard (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 1992): they do not have a separate bedroom and living room; they do not have kitchen and bathroom facilities of their own; their accommodation is not self-contained; and they do not have security of tenure provided by a lease.

2 OVERCOUNTING AND UNDERCOUNTING

Chapter 2 summarises how the national homeless count enumerated the homeless population using census and other data sets. It contains a discussion of how there can be both overcounting and undercounting of homeless people. Undercounting is most likely in the census category 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out', and overcounting is more likely

in boarding houses because of misclassification.

The problem of establishing reliable figures is compounded by the fact that the homeless population changes over time. There will always be people who are entering and leaving homelessness, as well as people moving between different locations. The challenge is to identify patterns in the population data that might inform the policy process.

3 ACCOMMODATION ON CENSUS NIGHT

Across Australia, people staying temporarily with other households accounted for 45 per cent of the homeless on census night, and in Tasmania they accounted for 50 per cent of the homeless (Table 1). Nationally, 19 per cent of the homeless were in SAAP accommodation, but in Tasmania the figure was 25 per cent. Twenty per cent of the homeless were in boarding houses nationally, but in Tasmania it was 10 per cent. Fifteen per cent of the homeless were in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping rough in Tasmania, similar to the national figure of 16 per cent. However, the census was carried out in August when people sleeping rough hide away to escape the cold, so there could have been undercounting in this category.

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION

	Australia		Tasmania	
	N	%	N	%
Boarding houses	21 596	20	252	10
SAAP accommodation	19 849	19	622	25
Friends and relatives	46 856	45	1248	50
Improvised dwellings, sleepers out	16 375	16	385	15
	104 676	100	2507	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

4 AGE DISTRIBUTION

The age profile of the homeless population in Tasmania was significantly younger than the age profile of the national population (Table 2). Sixty-nine per cent of the homeless in Tasmania were aged 34 or younger and 31 per cent were aged 35 or older. One-third (31 per cent) of the homeless were teenagers aged 12 to 18 (mainly on their own), 50 per cent higher than the national figure of 21 per cent. Fourteen per cent of the homeless were children under 12 who were with one or both parents. Another nine per cent were young adults aged 19 to 24. Altogether, 54 per cent of the

homeless in Tasmania were aged 24 or younger, significantly higher than the national figure of 43 per cent.

TABLE 2: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOMELESS POPULATION

	Australia			Tasmania		
	N	%		N	%	
Under 12	12 133	12	58	342	14	69
12–18	21 940	21		770	31	
19–24	10 504	10		226	9	
25–34	15 804	15	42	374	15	31
35–44	13 981	13		295	12	
45–54	12 206	12		235	9	
55–64	10 708	10		159	6	
65 or older	7 400	7		106	4	
	104 676	100		2507	100	

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

5 MALES AND FEMALES

Men outnumbered women in the national homeless population, 56 to 44 per cent in 2006 (Table 3), but in Tasmania men outnumbered women, 51 to 49 per cent. In Tasmania, there were more females in the under-12, 12-to-18 and 19-to-24 age cohorts. However, males made up between 55 and 60 per cent of the population in the age cohorts above 24.

TABLE 3: PERCENTAGE OF MALES AND FEMALES BY AGE GROUP

Australia									
	Under 12	12–18	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Male	52	46	53	57	63	64	61	64	56
Female	48	54	47	43	37	36	39	36	44
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Tasmania									
	Under 12	12–18	19–24	25–34	35–44	45–54	55–64	65+	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Male	49	43	48	55	60	59	57	55	51
Female	51	57	52	45	40	41	43	45	49
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

6 INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS

In Tasmania, 3.7 per cent of people identified as Indigenous at the 2006 Census. Table 4 shows that Indigenous people made up 4.4 per cent of people in boarding houses in Tasmania, 6.2 per cent of people staying with other households, 6.5 per cent of people in the improvised dwellings category, and 15.5 per cent of people in SAAP. Indigenous people were overrepresented in all sections of the homeless population in Tasmania.

TABLE 4: PERCENTAGE OF INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION, TASMANIA

	Boarding house (N=252)	Friends or relatives (N=1243)	SAAP (N=608)	Improvised dwellings (N=385)	All* (N=2488)
	%	%	%	%	%
Non-Indigenous	95.6	93.8	84.5	93.5	91.7
Indigenous	4.4	6.2	15.5	6.5	8.3
	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

* Figures have been adjusted for missing data on Indigenous status, except in 19 cases where there was inadequate information to make the adjustment.

7 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

Tasmania is divided into four statistical divisions: Greater Hobart, Southern, Northern and Mersey-Lyell.

Greater Hobart has a population of 200 500. It includes the statistical local areas of Brighton, Clarence, Derwent Valley, Glenorchy, Hobart Inner and Hobart Remainder. In Greater Hobart, the rate of homelessness was 53 per 10 000 and there were 1060 homeless people.

Table 5 shows that there were 474 homeless people in Hobart (Inner and Remainder) where the rate of homelessness was 99 per 10 000. In the remainder of Greater Hobart, there were 586 homeless people but the rate was 38 per 10 000. It is usual to find a higher rate of homelessness in the inner suburbs of capital cities, where services for homeless people have traditionally been located.

TABLE 5: NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE AND RATE PER 10 000 OF THE POPULATION, GREATER HOBART

	Hobart (Inner and Remainder)	Remainder of Greater Hobart
Number	474	586
Rate	99	38

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

The Northern statistical division covers the central north of Tasmania and the north-east coast. It has a population of 134 000. The major urban area is Greater Launceston with a population of 99 700.

Table 6 shows that four-fifths of the homeless population in the Northern statistical division were in Greater Launceston, where the rate of homelessness was 49 per 10 000 and there were 490 homeless people. The rates were lower in Central North (32 per 10 000) and North Eastern (40 per 10 000) where there were 65 and 56 homeless people respectively.

TABLE 6: NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE AND RATE PER 10 000 OF THE POPULATION

	Northern			Mersey-Lyell		
	Greater Launceston	Central North	North Eastern	Burnie-Devonport	North Western Rural	Lyell
Number	490	65	56	390	120	13
Rate	49	32	40	50	51	26

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

Mersey-Lyell covers much of north-west Tasmania and the west coast. It has a population of 106 000, including 77 400 in the Burnie-Devonport growth corridor.

Table 6 shows that nearly three-quarters of the homeless (390 people) were in Burnie-Devonport, where the rate was 50 per 10 000. The rate was similar in North Western Rural (51 per 10 000), where there were 120 homeless people. The rate was 26 per 10 000 in Lyell, where there were 13 homeless people in a population of 5000.

INTRODUCTION

This is one of eight state and territory reports from the national project, *Counting the Homeless 2006* (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2008). Chapters 1 and 2 include material from the national report on the definition of homelessness, methodological issues, and a summary of how the homeless enumeration was undertaken. This report introduces new information on the social characteristics of the homeless population in Tasmania and the geographical distribution of homeless people. The report also includes new information on marginal caravan park dwellers and Indigenous homelessness.

The main data source for the analysis was the *ABS Census of Population and Housing 2006*. However, this data was supplemented by information from the *SAAP National Data Collection* and the third *National Census of Homeless School Students*. This data enabled us to make various technical corrections to the raw census figures and to produce the overall population estimates.

This report uses some qualitative data from telephone interviews with service providers and public officials. Local informants were selected purposively, in order to check the reliability of census data in particular communities and to understand more about what is happening on the ground. In most places, three to four people were interviewed.

Each state and territory report is set out in the same way and contains a discussion of 'undercounting' and 'overcounting'. Counting errors are always an issue when enumerating the homeless population. Chapter 2 explains why some homeless people are not counted on census night ('undercounting') and why others may be counted more than once ('overcounting'). A careful consideration of such errors is important when attempting to establish the number of homeless people in particular communities.

Discrepancies due to undercounting and overcounting of homeless people tend to be masked when data is aggregated at the state or national level, but these discrepancies are more obvious in small-area analyses. Thus, it is possible that people with local knowledge may think that there are more (or less) homeless people in a particular community than the number identified by the census.

The problem of establishing reliable figures in local communities is compounded by the fact that the homeless population changes over time. First, there will always be some people entering and leaving the homeless population. Second, homeless people are more mobile than the general population. It is common for homeless people to move from one form of temporary shelter to another. It is also common for homeless people to move both within and between states. This means that the number of homeless people in a particular community may not be the same as the number on census night. The challenge is to identify patterns in the homeless population that might inform the policy process.

Chapter 1 outlines the cultural definition of homelessness which underpinned the ABS project. Chapter 2 summarises how the national report established the homeless count, as well as discussing overcounting and undercounting. Chapter 3 outlines the social characteristics of the homeless population in Tasmania. Chapter 4 discusses different ways of approaching a geographical analysis, before investigating whether the homeless population was spread evenly. Chapter 5 comments on Indigenous and non-Indigenous homelessness. Chapter 6 discusses policy issues.

1 DEFINITION OF HOMELESSNESS

The ABS uses the cultural definition to enumerate the homeless population. The cultural definition contends that 'homelessness' and 'inadequate housing' are cultural concepts that only make sense in a particular community at a given historical period (Chamberlain and Mackenzie 1992). In a society where the vast majority of people live in mud huts, the community standard will be that these dwellings constitute adequate accommodation (Watson 1986, p. 10). Once this principle is recognised, then it is possible to define 'homelessness'.

First, the cultural definition identifies shared community standards about the minimum housing that people have the right to expect in order to live according to the conventions and expectations of a particular culture. Then, the definition identifies groups that fall below the minimum community standard.

Cultural standards are not usually stated in official documents, but are embedded in the housing practices of a society. These standards identify the conventions and cultural expectations of a community in an objective sense, and are recognised by most people because they accord with what they see around them. As Townsend (1979, p. 51) puts it:

A population comes to expect to live in particular types of homes ... Their environment ... create(s) their needs in an objective as well as a subjective sense.

The vast majority of Australians live in suburban houses or self-contained flats, and 70 per cent of all households either own or are purchasing their home (ABS 2006a, Ch. 8). There is a widespread view that home ownership is the most desirable form of tenure (Kemeny 1983, p. 1; Hayward 1992, p. 1; Badcock and Beer 2000, p. 96). Eighty-eight per cent of private dwellings in Australia are houses and 75 per cent of flats have two or more bedrooms (ABS 2006a, Ch. 8).

The minimum community standard is a small rental flat—with a bedroom, living room, kitchen, bathroom and an element of security of tenure—because that is the minimum that most people achieve in the private rental market. However, the minimum is significantly below the culturally desired option of an owner-occupied house.

The minimum community standard provides a cultural benchmark for assessing ‘homelessness’ and ‘inadequate housing’ in the contemporary context. However, as Chamberlain and MacKenzie (1992) point out, there are a number of institutional settings where people do not have the minimal level of accommodation identified by the community standard, but in cultural terms they are not considered part of the homeless population. They include, inter alia, people living in seminaries, elderly people in nursing homes, students in university halls of residence and prisoners.

1.1 A MODEL OF HOMELESSNESS BASED ON SHARED COMMUNITY STANDARDS EMBODIED IN CURRENT HOUSING PRACTICES

Minimum community standard: equivalent to a small rented flat with a bedroom, living room, kitchen and bathroom

<p>Culturally recognised exceptions: where it is inappropriate to apply the minimum standard, e.g. seminaries, gaols, student halls of residence</p>	<p>Marginally housed: people in housing situations close to the minimum standard</p> <p>Tertiary homelessness: people living in single rooms in private boarding houses without their own bathroom, kitchen or security of tenure</p> <p>Secondary homelessness: people moving between various forms of temporary shelter including friends and relatives, emergency accommodation, youth refuges, hostels and boarding houses</p> <p>Primary homelessness: people without conventional accommodation (living on the streets, in deserted buildings, improvised dwellings, under bridges, in parks, etc.)</p>
---	---

Source: Chamberlain and MacKenzie 1992, p. 291.

While it is true that the concepts of ‘housed’ and ‘homeless’ constitute a continuum of circumstances, there are three situations that fall below the minimum community standard. This leads to the identification of ‘primary’, ‘secondary’ and ‘tertiary’ homelessness. The model (shown in Figure 1.1) also includes the concept of the ‘marginally housed’.

Primary homelessness accords with the common assumption that homelessness is the same as ‘rooflessness’. The category includes people living on the streets, sleeping in parks, squatting in derelict buildings, living in improvised dwellings (such as sheds, garages or cabins), and using cars or railway carriages for temporary shelter. Primary homelessness is operationalised using the census category ‘improvised homes, tents and sleepers out’.

Secondary homelessness includes people who move frequently from one form of temporary shelter to another. On census night, it includes all people staying in emergency or transitional accommodation provided under the

Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP). The starting point for identifying this group is the census category 'hostels for the homeless, night shelters and refuges'. Secondary homelessness also includes people residing temporarily with other households because they have no accommodation of their own. They report 'no usual address' on their census form. Secondary homelessness also includes people staying in boarding houses on a short-term basis, operationally defined as 12 weeks or less.

Tertiary homelessness refers to people who live in boarding houses on a medium- to long-term basis, operationally defined as 13 weeks or longer. Residents of private boarding houses do not have separate bedrooms and living rooms; they do not have kitchen and bathroom facilities of their own; their accommodation is not self-contained; and they do not have security of tenure provided by a lease. They are homeless because their accommodation does not have the characteristics identified in the minimum community standard.

The terms primary, secondary and tertiary homelessness are widely used, particularly when talking about census counts. However, the profile of the homeless population looks different if you classify people on the basis of their housing histories, rather than on the basis of their accommodation on census night. In a study of 4291 homeless people in Melbourne, Chamberlain, Johnson and Theobald (2007) found that 92 per cent of their sample had moved regularly from one form of temporary accommodation to another. Nearly everyone had stayed with friends or relatives, but 85 per cent had also stayed in a boarding house, 60 per cent had been in SAAP/THM accommodation, and 50 per cent had slept rough. People show up in particular places on census night but many homeless people will be somewhere else a few weeks later. Transience is the typical pattern. Primary, secondary and tertiary homelessness are useful categories to describe people's housing situations on census night, but there are not three distinct groups of homeless people.

In *Counting the Homeless 2001*, we also identified ‘marginal residents of caravan parks’. These people were defined as renting caravans, at their usual address, with no one in the household having full-time work. Like boarding house tenants, these households have one room for eating and sleeping and communal bathroom facilities. The 2001 research found that two-thirds (67 per cent) of boarding house residents were in the capital cities whereas three-quarters (78 per cent) of marginal residents of caravan parks were in regional centres and country towns (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2003, Ch. 7). In some communities, there are no boarding houses and SAAP workers send people to the local caravan park if there is no emergency accommodation available.

There is some disagreement as to whether marginal residents of caravan parks constitute a separate category. Reid, Griffin and Murdoch (2005) have examined this analysis carefully. They conclude that marginal residents of caravan parks are really part of the tertiary population. Giovanetti, Reid, Murdoch and Edwards (2007, p. 275) take a similar position:

Marginal residents of caravan parks were categorised as belonging to the tertiary homelessness category ...

We have two reservations about this approach. First, it is difficult for the wider community to accept that some people living in caravans are part of the tertiary homeless population when most caravan dwellers are on holiday or own their own caravan. The 2006 Census found that 56 per cent of individuals in caravan parks were on holiday. The census was held in winter and this figure would have been much higher in the summer months. Another 25 per cent owned their caravan and many had made a lifestyle choice to live in a caravan, typically following retirement. Only 14 per cent were marginal residents on census night and this figure would be significantly below 10 per cent in the summer months.

Second, it is now common to find that cabins are the main type of accommodation in caravan parks, and cabins often have better facilities than caravans. A cabin usually has a separate kitchen and bathroom and often has one or more bedrooms. The census cannot distinguish between households in caravans and cabins with certainty, but in 2006 we estimated that somewhere between one-quarter and one-half of marginal residents of caravan parks were living in cabins (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2008, Ch. 7). This finding undermines the argument that marginal residents of caravan parks should be considered part of the tertiary population. It also means that our ‘marginal residents’ category is broader than indicated in *Counting the Homeless 2001*.

2 OVERCOUNTING AND UNDERCOUNTING

This chapter summarises how the national project enumerated the homeless population using the census and other data sets. It also contains a discussion of how there can be both overcounting and undercounting of homeless people. This is relevant to understanding why there can be anomalies when we examine the number of homeless people in particular communities.

2.1 IMPROVISED HOMES, TENTS AND SLEEPERS OUT

The operational category for primary homelessness is 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out'. This category includes:

Sheds, tents, humpies, and other improvised dwellings, occupied on Census Night ... It also includes people sleeping on park benches or in other 'rough accommodation'. (ABS 2006b, p. 182)

First, we explain how the count was carried out. Then we estimate the number of persons in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of persons sleeping rough (public places, derelict buildings, tents, cars etc). Finally, we point out that rough sleepers are a very mobile population and therefore the numbers identified on census night may not accord with what people 'know' on the ground.

The efficacy of the local count depends on census collectors having good local knowledge. They have to know, for example, whether there are people squatting in empty buildings in their local community, or whether there might be families living in their cars, or whether there could be people camping in the bush.

In 2006, there was a special effort to count the primary population in all states and territories. People without conventional accommodation are particularly difficult to count because they usually hide away at night to escape the cold. The 2006 Census was carried out in winter in the southern states, where night-time temperatures were generally cold. In addition, some homeless people were hostile to the idea of providing information to the government and did not want to fill out official forms. Other homeless people were hidden away in derelict buildings and census collectors were unaware of their presence. Counting the primary population is a major

practical challenge.

There were a number of components to the ABS strategy. Field staff were encouraged to work closely with local service providers who might know if people were squatting in derelict buildings or sleeping rough in their community. In all states, local services provided intelligence on where people might be found sleeping rough. In some cases, census forms were handed out at these agencies. It was also widely reported that mobile food vans were a good place to hand out census forms. This strategy was used in capital cities and in some regional centres, but implementation varied across the states.

The ABS also had short census forms that could be filled out by ABS staff where personal forms were judged inappropriate. The short forms were less intimidating than the longer personal forms.

In addition, there was a procedure for filling out a substitute form when a homeless person was observed by a census collector but was not able to be interviewed. Observation is an accepted method for counting people sleeping rough. Collectors were asked to record sex, estimated age and location.

The category 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out' also included overseas visitors and Australian residents who were on camping holidays. International visitors can be identified because they report a usual address overseas, and Australian holidaymakers can be identified because they report a usual address 'elsewhere in Australia'. Once both groups were removed, this left 16 375 individuals nationally in 'improvised dwellings, tents and sleepers out', including 385 people in this category in Tasmania.

Next, we estimate the number of persons in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of persons sleeping rough (public places, derelict buildings, tents, cars etc). In public discussions about homelessness, it is sometimes assumed that there are 16 375 rough sleepers. However, the category 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out' includes a wide range of situations from someone sleeping in a park, to someone sheltering in a derelict building, to someone living in a shed of some kind. Sheds can vary from broken-down buildings to assembled colour-bond farm sheds and garages.

There were 16 375 people in the 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out' category, made up of 9414 households. It is not possible to quantify with certainty the number of people in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of rough sleepers, but if we make two assumptions we can make some estimates.

First, we examined the responses of people in the 'improvised homes' category to the census question about dwelling tenure. We found that that 10 per cent were in rented dwellings and 39 per cent of households were in dwellings that were owned or being purchased. After talking with building inspectors and town planners across the country, we made the judgment that the 'owner, purchaser, renter' reply indicated that these households were usually living in improvised dwellings such as sheds, garages and shacks. In the case of owners and purchasers, this was their own property. It is also probable that people living in cars would have reported 'owning' their dwellings and this is more likely to be the case in the cities.

Second, 51 per cent of households did not answer the question about dwelling tenure and we took this to indicate that they were sleeping rough, squatting in derelict buildings, or living in other forms of temporary shelter. This assumption was in accord with other information from service providers and council staff in local areas. If both assumptions are reasonable, then we can estimate the numbers in improvised dwellings and sleeping rough, but we cannot quantify this exactly.

In the capital cities, about 75 per cent of households in the primary homelessness category were sleeping rough or squatting in derelict buildings, but in Hobart it was about 40 per cent. In regional Australia, about 60 per cent of these households were living in sheds, garages and shacks and in regional Tasmania it was about 80 per cent. Most of these dwellings were on land that was 'owned or being purchased', but about one-quarter of the dwellings were rented. Both owners and renters were living in rural poverty.

Building inspectors and town planners across the country reported that most people living in sheds were not building houses. In many cases, the householder had laid a concrete slab and then erected a metal shed, assembled from a prefabricated kit. We were told that people in improvised dwellings had often moved into communities where it was possible to purchase cheap blocks of land and they had probably dreamed of building houses on their blocks. However, these were also communities where unemployment was high and the newcomers remained unemployed or marginally attached to the labour force. These families may have dreamed of building a house, but the dream had not been realised and they were living in rural poverty.

In the capital cities, people in the category ‘improvised homes, tents and sleepers out’ are usually transient and without conventional shelter. In regional and remote Australia, about 40 per cent of households in this category were transient but 60 per cent were living in improvised dwellings which they owned, rented or were purchasing. These dwellings were below the community standard, but these households were not ‘rough sleepers’ and they were not transient.

In the cities, people sleeping rough, squatting in derelict buildings or using vehicles for shelter are likely to move from place to place. Twenty people may show up in a particular subdivision on census night, but a week later they may be somewhere else. When we carry out a local analysis there is a risk that it will not accord with what people ‘know’ on the ground, because the population may have changed since the time of the census. However, in inland Australia, people in improvised dwellings are more stable.

2.2 SAAP SERVICES

The starting point for counting people in accommodation provided under the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) was the census category ‘hostels for the homeless, night shelters and refuges’. However, we knew that many of these dwellings were misclassified at previous censuses (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2003, pp. 23–24). Youth refuges and women’s refuges often look like suburban houses and sometimes census collectors did not realise they were SAAP accommodation. These dwellings were mistakenly classified as ‘private dwellings’. The ABS convention is to replace census figures with information from the SAAP National Data Collection if the SAAP figures are higher.

In 2006, the ABS had two strategies to count people accommodated in refuges, hostels and other forms of emergency accommodation. The ‘list strategy’ required the Census Management Unit (CMU) in each state/territory to consult with the relevant government department to see if the department could supply a list of all their SAAP properties. The ABS guaranteed the confidentiality of these lists. The lists were passed on to specified ABS officers to assist with confidential data processing. The lists enabled ABS staff to identify SAAP properties that had been classified as private dwellings.

All states provided lists but they were of uneven quality. Some states provided a comprehensive list of their supported accommodation. Other states provided a list but excluded women’s refuges (for security reasons), while other states provided only partial lists of their SAAP properties.

The second component of the ABS approach was the 'green sticker' strategy which was first used in 2001. This involved the distribution of information to service providers offering them an alternative way to return their census forms. Service providers were advised that they could request a mail-back envelope from the census collector to ensure confidentiality. Service providers were asked to return the census forms directly to the Data Processing Centre and to attach a green sticker which facilitated the identification of SAAP accommodation.

Overall, the census strategy worked better than in 2001, but in all states (except Victoria) the census count was lower than the SAAP count. The Victorian Department provided the ABS with a full list of its SAAP addresses as well as a full list of its Transitional Housing Management (THM) properties. We followed the established convention and replaced the census data with National SAAP Data for all states and territories except Victoria. There were 19 849 people in SAAP across Australia and 622 in Tasmania.

2.3 FRIENDS AND RELATIVES

Homeless people staying temporarily with friends or relatives were identified at the question: 'What is the person's usual address?' There was an instruction on the census form that people with no usual address should write 'none' in the suburb/locality box. In 2006, the number of people staying temporarily with other households was 32 200.

The census underestimates the number of homeless young people aged 12 to 18 who are staying temporarily with friends or relatives, because people filling out the census forms often record that these teenagers have a usual address elsewhere (MacKenzie and Chamberlain 2008, Ch. 3). We corrected for undercounting in this age group using information from the third National Census of Homeless School Students.

The count of homeless school students was carried out in the same week that the ABS undertook the 2006 Census of Population and Housing. Welfare staff in secondary schools identified 7035 homeless students using the cultural definition of homelessness. This figure was used in conjunction with SAAP data on the proportion of school students accommodated in SAAP to estimate the overall homeless population aged 12 to 18. The final correction for undercounting was 14 656. The number of homeless people staying temporarily with friends and relatives was 46 856, including 1248 people in Tasmania.

There was no information on how the missing 14 656 young people were distributed geographically within each state and territory. An assumption was made that they were distributed in the same way as other persons staying temporarily with friends and relatives. This assumption cannot be corroborated independently, and it could mean that homeless people in this category were overestimated in some geographical areas and underestimated in others.

The method of estimating the number of persons staying temporarily with other households also depends on how people interpret the census question that asks for each person's usual address. For example, an Indigenous household may be unwilling to record that a relative escaping domestic violence has 'no usual address'. We have a method for estimating the undercount for those aged 12 to 18, but there is no method for estimating the undercount in other age groups or for Indigenous people.

Finally, it is important to remember that the number of people staying temporarily with friends and relatives also goes up and down, because most people stay temporarily with other households on a short-term basis.

2.4 BOARDING HOUSES

The final category is people living in boarding houses. This was the most complicated part of the count and it is explained fully in Chamberlain and MacKenzie (2008). Here the main points are summarised in three steps: a discussion of the 'basic rules', the '2001 conventions' and the '2006 conventions'.

Basic rules

The 2006 Census used 20 categories for coding non-private dwellings. The categories included 'hotel, motel, bed and breakfast' and 'boarding house, private hotel'. This distinction draws attention to the fact that there are major differences between conventional hotels that many travellers use and boarding houses (often called 'private hotels').

The 2006 Census identified 16 273 people in 'boarding houses and private hotels'. However, three groups had to be excluded: owners and staff members who were sleeping over on census night; guests who reported a usual address 'elsewhere in Australia'; and backpackers who reported a usual address overseas.

In addition, there are four ABS conventions to correct for the fact that census collectors sometimes misclassify 'boarding houses', 'hotels' and 'staff quarters'. After applying the 'basic rules', the number in boarding houses was 14 490 in 2006 compared with 17 972 in 2001.

2001 conventions

There was an important change in ABS procedures in 2001 which impacted on the boarding house count. Following the 1996 census, ABS staff telephoned those dwellings where there was insufficient information to identify dwelling type. Where additional information could be obtained a more accurate classification was entered. In 2001, these follow-up telephone calls were discontinued and the number of dwellings in the 'other' category increased from 536 to 2784. The number of persons in those dwellings jumped from 12 938 to 54 636 and it remained at 54 000 in 2006.

The '2001 conventions' involve the application of five rules to identify boarding houses in the 'other' category (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2003, Ch. 3). When these rules were applied in 2006, they produced a correction of 3763.

2006 conventions

Boarding houses have been closing down in the inner suburbs of the capital cities, but new boarding houses have been opening up in some outer suburbs. These dwellings often look like suburban houses and rarely have a sign outside. Census collectors could have misclassified these boarding houses as 'private dwellings'.

In 2006, an investigation was undertaken to see whether it was possible to identify boarding houses in the 'private dwellings' category. The final stage of the investigation focused on 9000 private dwellings that had five or more unrelated adults. A small boarding house or a share household could have five or more unrelated tenants. Five criteria were devised to exclude working households, student households, housing for disabled people and dwellings that were too small to be boarding houses. After the rules were applied, there were 705 dwellings remaining with 3343 residents. These were boarding houses that had been misclassified as private dwellings.

In 2006, the total number of persons in boarding houses was 21 596 ($14\,490 + 3763 + 3343 = 21\,596$), compared with 22 877 in 2001. The number of boarding house residents in Tasmania was 252 in 2006, compared with 265 in 2001.

The ABS conventions for identifying boarding houses are complicated and it is possible that some dwellings could have been misclassified at all three stages of the analysis. Undercounting could have occurred in some communities and overcounting in others because of misclassification. This can lead to anomalies when we examine the number of people in boarding houses in particular subdivisions.

2.5 CONCLUSION

The census provides the best data that we have on the homeless population at a point in time, but as we have seen there can be ‘undercounting’ and ‘overcounting’ of homeless people on census night. Undercounting is most likely in the census category ‘improvised homes, tents and sleepers out’, and overcounting is more likely in the boarding house category because of misclassification.

The problem of establishing reliable census figures for policy purposes is compounded by the fact that the homeless population changes over time. New people become homeless and some homeless people return to secure accommodation, so the number of homeless people goes up and down.

It is also common for homeless people to move between different forms of temporary accommodation within the same city, and to move both within and between states. The census data was collected in August 2006, and it is unrealistic to expect the same number of homeless people in particular areas at the current time. The challenge is to identify patterns in the population data that might inform the policy process.

3 SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter describes the social characteristics of the homeless population in Tasmania. First, we compare the rate of homelessness and the number of homeless people in each state and territory. Then we investigate where homeless people were staying on census night. After that we describe the age and gender characteristics of the population. Finally, we comment on the number of Indigenous people.

3.1 HOW MANY?

There are two ways of approaching the geographical spread of the homeless population and both are important. First, there is the number of homeless people in each state and territory on census night. Second, homelessness can be expressed as a rate per 10 000 of the population. This statistic is required for comparing states and territories of different sizes.

Table 3.1 shows that the rates of homelessness in each state and territory did not change much between 2001 and 2006. In the southern states (New South Wales, Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory), there were 42 homeless people per 10 000 in 2006, similar to the rates recorded in those states in 2001. South Australia and Tasmania each had a rate of 53 per 10 000 in 2006, again similar to their rates in 2001. The rates of homelessness in the other states were higher. In Western Australia and Queensland, there were between 64 and 70 homeless people per 10 000 at both censuses. In the Northern Territory, there were 248 homeless people per 10 000 in 2006.

3.1 RATE OF HOMELESSNESS PER 10 000 OF THE POPULATION

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	ACT	Aust
2006	42	42	69	68	53	53	248	42	53
2001	42	44	70	64	52	52	288	40	53

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2001, 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2001, 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2001, 2006.

Table 3.2 shows the number of homeless people in each state and territory in 2001 and 2006. In Tasmania, it was 2415 in 2001 and 2507 in 2006. We know that the number of homeless people goes up and down, but in Tasmania a typical point-in-time figure is probably about 2500, up from about 2415 in 2001.

3.2 NUMBER OF HOMELESS BY STATE AND TERRITORY

	NSW	Vic	Qld	WA	SA	Tas	NT	ACT	Aust
2006	27 374	20 511	26 782	13 391	7962	2507	4785	1364	104 676
2001	26 676	20 305	24 569	11 697	7586	2415	5423	1229	99 900

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2001, 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2001, 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2001, 2006.

3.2 ACCOMMODATION ON CENSUS NIGHT

Next we investigate where homeless people were staying on census night. Across Australia, people staying temporarily with other households accounted for 45 per cent of the homeless on census night, and in Tasmania they accounted for 50 per cent of the homeless (Table 3.3). Nationally, 19 per cent of the homeless were in SAAP accommodation, but in Tasmania the figure was 25 per cent. Twenty per cent of the homeless were in boarding houses nationally, but in Tasmania it was 10 per cent. Fifteen per cent of the homeless were in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping rough in Tasmania, similar to the national figure of 16 per cent. However, the census was carried out in August when people sleeping rough hide away to escape the cold, so there could have been undercounting in this category.

3.3 NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION

	Australia		Tasmania	
	N	%	N	%
Boarding houses	21 596	20	252	10
SAAP accommodation	19 849	19	622	25
Friends and relatives	46 856	45	1248	50
Improvised dwellings, sleepers out	16 375	16	385	15
	104 676	100	2507	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

In Tasmania, the proportions of people in various types of accommodation were somewhat different in 2001 and 2006 (Table 3.4). In 2006, 50 per cent of the homeless were staying with friends or relatives

on census night, but this figure was down from 66 per cent in 2001. The proportion in SAAP was up from 13 per cent in 2001 to 25 per cent in 2006 (315 people to 622). The proportion in boarding houses was steady at 10 per cent, and the number of people in improvised dwellings increased from 10 per cent of the homeless to 15 per cent (237 to 385 people).

3.4 NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION, TASMANIA, 2001 AND 2006

	2001		2006	
	N	%	N	%
Boarding houses	265	11	252	10
SAAP accommodation	315	13	622	25
Friends and relatives	1598	66	1248	50
Improvised dwellings, sleepers out	237	10	385	15
	2415	100	2507	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2001, 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2001, 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2001, 2006.

The census takes a ‘snapshot’ of where homeless people are staying on census night, but it is important to remember that homeless people often move from one form of temporary accommodation to another. There is a high degree of permeability between the four operational categories used to count the homeless population on census night. There would have been some people living in boarding houses on a long-term basis (tertiary homelessness) and a small number living ‘permanently’ in improvised dwellings (primary homelessness). However, most homeless people would have been moving between different forms of temporary accommodation, including friends and relatives, SAAP accommodation, boarding houses and improvised dwellings. Transience is the typical pattern.

3.3 AGE DISTRIBUTION

In the 1950s and 1960s, it was thought that the homeless population was disproportionately made up of middle-aged and older men (de Hoog 1972; Jordan 1973, 1994). For example, Jordan (1994, p. 21) reported that there were few teenagers in the population and that 80 per cent of the men in his sample were aged 35 or older. De Hoog (1972) gives a similar impression in his ethnographic account of life on Sydney’s skid row at the end of the 1960s.

Table 3.5 shows that the age profile of the population is now very different. First, we examine the national figures, then we look at the figures for Tasmania.

In 2006, 58 per cent of the homeless across Australia were in the younger age groups and only 42 per cent were aged 35 or older. Twelve per cent of the homeless were children under 12. These young people were with parents on census night. Another 21 per cent of the homeless were teenagers aged 12 to 18 (mainly on their own) and 10 per cent were young adults aged 19 to 24. The age profile of the population is now much younger than 40 to 50 years ago.

The age profile of the homeless population in Tasmania was significantly younger than the age profile of the national population. Sixty-nine per cent of the homeless in Tasmania were aged 34 or younger and 31 per cent were aged 35 or older. One-third (31 per cent) of the homeless were teenagers aged 12 to 18 (mainly on their own), 50 per cent higher than the national figure of 21 per cent. Fourteen per cent of the homeless were children under 12 who were with one or both parents. Another nine per cent were young adults aged 19 to 24. Altogether, 54 per cent of the homeless in Tasmania were aged 24 or younger, significantly higher than the national figure of 43 per cent.

3.5 AGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOMELESS POPULATION

	Australia			Tasmania		
	N	%		N	%	
Under 12	12 133	12	58	342	14	69
12-18	21 940	21		770	31	
19-24	10 504	10		226	9	
25-34	15 804	15		374	15	
35-44	13 981	13	42	295	12	31
45-54	12 206	12		235	9	
55-64	10 708	10		159	6	
65 or older	7 400	7		106	4	
	104 676	100		2507	100	

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

3.4 MALES AND FEMALES

Men outnumbered women in the national homeless population, 56 to 44 per cent in 2006 (Table 3.6), but in Tasmania men outnumbered women, 51 to 49 per cent. In Tasmania, there were more females in the under-12, 12-to-18 and 19-to-24 age cohorts. However, males made up between 55 and 60 per cent of the population in the age cohorts above 24.

3.6 PERCENTAGE OF MALES AND FEMALES BY AGE GROUP

Australia

	Under 12	12-18	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Male	52	46	53	57	63	64	61	64	56
Female	48	54	47	43	37	36	39	36	44
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Tasmania

	Under 12	12-18	19-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	All
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Male	49	43	48	55	60	59	57	55	51
Female	51	57	52	45	40	41	43	45	49
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

Table 3.7 shows the proportion of males and females in different sectors on census night. Nationally, 72 per cent of boarding house residents were male, and in Tasmania the figure was 61 per cent.. Amongst people sleeping rough in Tasmania, men outnumbered women, 56 to 44 per cent. There were slightly more women than men staying with other households (52 to 48 per cent), and there were equal proportions of men and women in SAAP.

3.7 PERCENTAGE OF MALES AND FEMALES IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION

Australia

	Boarding house (N=21 596)	Friends or relatives (N=46 856)	SAAP (N=19 849)	Improvised dwellings (N=16 375)	All (N=104 676)
	%	%	%	%	%
Male	72	52	47	60	56
Female	28	48	53	40	44
	100	100	100	100	100

Tasmania

	Boarding house (N=252)	Friends or relatives (N=1248)	SAAP (N=622)	Improvised dwellings (N=385)	All (N=2507)
	%	%	%	%	%
Male	61	48	50	56	51
Female	39	52	50	44	49
	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

3.5 INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS

In Tasmania, 3.7 per cent of people identified as Indigenous at the 2006 Census. Table 3.8 shows that Indigenous people made up 4.4 per cent of people in boarding houses in Tasmania, 6.2 per cent of people staying with other households, 6.5 per cent of people in improvised dwellings and 15.5 per cent of people in SAAP. Indigenous people were overrepresented in all sections of the homeless population in Tasmania.

3.8 PERCENTAGE OF INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION, TASMANIA

	Boarding house (N=252)	Friends or relatives (N=1243)	SAAP (N=608)	Improvised dwellings (N=385)	All* (N=2488)
	%	%	%	%	%
Non-Indigenous	95.6	93.8	84.5	93.5	91.7
Indigenous	4.4	6.2	15.5	6.5	8.3
	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

* Figures have been adjusted for missing data on Indigenous status, except in 19 cases where there was inadequate information to make the adjustment.

There is a risk that Indigenous people staying temporarily with other households were undercounted. The census asked for each person's usual address, and people with no usual address were asked to indicate this fact. Indigenous people interpret this question within a different cultural frame of reference.

Often, Indigenous people do not think of 'home' as a particular dwelling, because they are attached to their traditional land. Indigenous people also have extended kinship networks and they move between dwellings belonging to extended family members. When Indigenous people leave home to escape domestic violence or other family problems, they usually move in with households that are related to them. In these circumstances, it is not culturally appropriate to record 'no usual address' on census night, because 'home' is understood in a different way. This creates undercounting in this category.

3.6 SUMMARY

The number of homeless people fluctuates because people move in and out of homelessness. In Tasmania, we estimate that a typical point-in-time figure is about 2500 homeless people. Half (50 per cent) of the homeless were staying temporarily with other households on census night and 25 per cent were in SAAP. Fifteen per cent were in the primary population, up from 10 per cent in 2001 (237 to 385 people). Only 10 per cent were in boarding houses. However, the homeless population is very mobile and these percentages go up and down. Many homeless people are in the secondary population and they move between different forms of temporary shelter.

Nationally, 56 per cent of homeless people were male and 44 per cent were female. In Tasmania, men outnumbered women, 51 to 49 per cent. The homeless population in Tasmania was younger than the homeless population nationally, with 69 per cent of the homeless aged 34 or younger. Indigenous people were overrepresented in all sectors of the population, but particularly in SAAP.

4 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

This chapter discusses different ways of approaching a geographical analysis. Then it focuses on the distribution of the homeless population in Tasmania.

4.1 NUMBERS AND RATES

There are two ways of approaching the geographical spread of the homeless population and both are important. First, there is the number of homeless people in particular communities on census night. This is the 'raw' count and policy makers always need to be aware of these figures.

Second, homelessness can be expressed as a rate per 10 000 of the population. This statistic is required for comparing communities of different sizes. For example, the number of homeless people will always be greater in Hobart than in Smithton, because of the difference in population size, but the rate of homelessness may be the same in both communities.

However, it is important to be cautious when interpreting rates for two reasons. First, the rate of homelessness in a particular area does not tell us how many people in that community become homeless. For example, the rate of homelessness in Devonport quantifies the number of homeless people in relation to the Devonport population, but it does not tell us whether those people came from Devonport, other parts of Tasmania, or the mainland. Homeless people move around and the numbers in particular areas partly reflect the services that are available.


Second, it is important to be cautious when interpreting rates for geographical areas with small populations. Suppose that policy makers have the resources to fund one new SAAP service and they are evaluating the competing claims of two communities. In a small town of 2000 people the rate of homelessness was 100 per 10 000, whereas in a regional city of 30 000 it was 30 per 10 000. Should the resources go to the rural community or to the regional city?

In the rural community, there would have been 20 homeless people ($20 \times 10\,000/2000 = 100$ per 10 000), whereas in the regional city there would have been 90 homeless people ($90 \times 10\,000/30\,000 = 30$ per 10 000). When policy makers


MAP 1: TASMANIA, Statistical Divisions




MAP 2: TASMANIA, Statistical Subdivisions and Statistical Local Areas



MAP 3: TASMANIA, Statistical Subdivisions and Statistical Local Areas: Enlargement 1



MAP 3: TASMANIA, Statistical Subdivisions and Statistical Local Areas: Enlargement 1



MAP 4: TASMANIA, Statistical Subdivisions and Statistical Local Areas: Enlargement 2



allocate resources, they have to consider both the number of homeless people in a community and the rate of homelessness, as well as local intelligence about what is happening ‘on the ground’, in order to match services with expressed need.

4.2 GEOGRAPHICAL CATEGORIES

There are a number of ways of approaching a geographical analysis. The Australian Bureau of Statistics uses the Australian Standard Geographical Classification (ASGC) for the collection and dissemination of geographically organised statistics (ABS 2006c). The ASGC provides seven interrelated classification structures which are designed for different practical purposes. This report uses the ‘Main Structure’ which covers the whole of Australia without gaps or overlaps. The Main Structure comprises five hierarchical levels: census districts, statistical local areas, statistical subdivisions, statistical divisions, and states and territories. This analysis uses statistical divisions and statistical subdivisions as the main geographical categories, because patterns can be identified more easily if larger geographical categories are used.

In each state and territory, the capital city is treated as a statistical division which includes the greater metropolitan area and any anticipated growth corridors for at least the next 20 years. The statistical division ‘represents the city in a wider sense’ (ABS 2006c, p. 15). Statistical divisions outside of the capital cities are ‘relatively homogeneous region(s) characterised by identifiable ... links between the inhabitants and between the economic units within the region, under the unifying influence of one or more major towns or cities’ (ABS 2006c, p. 15).

Tasmania is divided into four statistical divisions (excluding off-shore and migratory). They are Greater Hobart, Southern, Northern and Mersey-Lyell (Map 1).

Statistical subdivisions are defined as ‘socially and economically homogeneous regions characterised by identifiable links between the inhabitants’ (ABS 2006c, p. 14). Most capital cities are divided into different statistical subdivisions, but Hobart only contains one statistical subdivision. In Tasmania, there are two statistical subdivisions which correspond to major regional population centres: Greater Launceston and Burnie-Devonport.

In other cases, statistical subdivisions cover non-urban areas. These are defined as rural areas which do not include cities with populations of 25 000 or above. These non-urban areas are said to have ‘identifiable links between the economic units within the region’ and there may be the ‘unifying influence’ (ABS 2006c, p. 14) of one or more country towns. In

Tasmania, these rural subdivisions have small populations and sometimes they have high rates of homelessness, but few homeless people.

4.3 DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION

The Greater Hobart statistical division has a population of 200 500. It includes the statistical local areas of Brighton, Clarence, Derwent Valley, Glenorchy, Hobart Inner and Hobart Remainder.

The Southern statistical division covers a large area surrounding Hobart, including southern and central Tasmania and parts of the east coast. It has a population of 34 900.

The Northern statistical division covers the central north of Tasmania and the north-east coast. It has a population of 134 000. The major urban area is Greater Launceston with a population of 99 700.

Mersey-Lyell covers much of north-west Tasmania and the west coast. It has a population of 106 000, including 77 400 in the Burnie-Devonport growth corridor.

4.1 NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE AND RATE PER 10 000 OF THE POPULATION, TASMANIAN STATISTICAL DIVISIONS

	Greater Hobart	Southern	Northern	Mersey-Lyell
Number	1060	308	611	523
Rate	53	88	46	49

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

Table 4.1 shows that the rate of homelessness was 53 per 10 000 in Greater Hobart, 88 per 10 000 in Southern, 46 per 10 000 in Northern and 49 per 10 000 in Mersey-Lyell. There were 1060 homeless people in Greater Hobart which has a much larger population than Southern, where there were 308 homeless people spread over a large area. There were 611 homeless people in Northern and 523 in Mersey-Lyell.

4.2 NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE AND RATE PER 10 000 OF THE POPULATION, GREATER HOBART

	Hobart (Inner and Remainder)	Remainder of Greater Hobart
Number	474	586
Rate	99	38

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

There was variation within the statistical divisions. Table 4.2 shows that there were 474 homeless people in Hobart (Inner and Remainder) ('inner Hobart') where the rate of homelessness was 99 per 10 000. In the remainder of Greater Hobart ('outer Hobart'), there were 586 homeless people but the rate was 38 per 10 000. It is usual to find a higher rate of homelessness in the inner suburbs of capital cities. This is the case in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth and Adelaide. Homeless people often gravitate to the inner city, where services for homeless people have traditionally been located.

4.3 PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION, GREATER HOBART

Percentage

	Hobart (Inner and Remainder)	Remainder of Greater Hobart
Boarding house	18	2
SAAP	51	20
Friends and relatives	26	61
Improvised dwellings	5	17
	100	100

Number

	Hobart (Inner and Remainder)	Remainder of Greater Hobart
Boarding house	86	10
SAAP	242	117
Friends and relatives	123	357
Improvised dwellings	23	102
	474	586

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

The homeless population was distributed differently in inner and outer Hobart. In inner Hobart, 51 per cent of the homeless were in SAAP accommodation and 26 per cent were staying temporarily with friends and relatives (Table 4.3), whereas in outer Hobart 61 per cent were staying temporarily with other households and only 20 per cent were in SAAP. This may indicate that there are more people with a longer-term problem in the inner city, and more people in the early stages of homelessness in the suburbs. It also reflects how services are distributed across the city.

Most people in boarding houses were in inner Hobart and most people in improvised dwellings were in the outer suburbs. There 23 people in the 'improvised dwellings' category who were sleeping rough in inner Hobart, but three-quarters of those in outer Hobart were in improvised dwellings

that were owned, being purchased or rented. Many were on low incomes and they were probably living in sheds, garages or cabins.

Four-fifths of the homeless population in the Northern statistical division was in Greater Launceston, where the rate of homelessness was 49 per 10 000 and there were 490 homeless people (Table 4.4). The rates were lower in Central North (32 per 10 000) and North Eastern (40 per 10 000) where there were 65 and 56 homeless people respectively.

4.4 NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE AND RATE PER 10 000 OF THE POPULATION

	Northern			Mersey-Lyell		
	Greater Launceston	Central North	North Eastern	Burnie-Devonport	North Western Rural	Lyell
Number	490	65	56	390	120	13
Rate	49	32	40	50	51	26

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

The pattern was similar in Mersey-Lyell. Nearly three-quarters of the homeless (390 people) were in Burnie-Devonport, where the rate was 50 per 10 000. The rate was similar in North Western Rural (51 per 10 000), where there were 120 homeless people. The rate was 26 per 10 000 in Lyell, where there were 13 homeless people in a population of 5000.

4.4 ACCOMMODATION ON CENSUS NIGHT

Table 4.5 shows that in Greater Hobart and Greater Launceston, about 45 per cent of the homeless were staying with friends and relatives on census night, and in Burnie the figure was 60 per cent. The fact that many homeless people stay temporarily with other households tends to make them invisible to the general population who assume that homeless people usually sleep rough. Local informants in Burnie and Devonport told us that ‘lots of people were couch surfing’ and that emergency accommodation was usually full. One informant said, ‘The SAAP situation is terrible at the moment. We have been putting people in backpackers’ hostels, caravan parks, or turning them away’.

The proportion of homeless people in SAAP accommodation ranged from 28 per cent in Burnie-Devonport to 34 per cent in Hobart (Table 4.5). There were only seven people in SAAP accommodation outside of the major cities in Tasmania.

4.5 PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION

Percentage

	Greater Hobart	Greater Launceston	Burnie-Devonport
Boarding house	9	20	7
SAAP	34	30	28
Friends and relatives	45	47	60
Improvised dwellings	12	3	5
	100	100	100

Number

	Greater Hobart	Greater Launceston	Burnie-Devonport
Boarding house	96	96	28
SAAP	359	149	107
Friends and relatives	480	232	234
Improvised dwellings	125	13	21
	1060	490	390

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

There were small numbers of people in boarding houses, with proportions ranging from seven per cent of the homeless in Burnie (28 people), to 20 per cent of the homeless in Launceston (96 people). It is often difficult to identify boarding houses because they can look like private dwellings, sometimes with outbuildings used as extra rooms. However, local service providers usually know where they are.

Finally, 12 per cent (125 people) of the homeless in Hobart were identified in the 'improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping rough' category. The numbers were lower in Burnie-Devonport and Launceston where five per cent and three per cent of the homeless were in improvised dwellings or sleeping rough, accounting for 21 and 13 people respectively. Local informants in Burnie and Devonport knew of people 'sleeping in cars', 'under bridges' or in 'improvised dwellings out in the bush'. It is possible that there was some undercounting in Burnie-Devonport.

4.6 PEOPLE IN DIFFERENT SECTORS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION, RURAL TASMANIA

Percentage						
	Southern	Central North	North Eastern	North Western Rural	Lyell	Total
Boarding house	1	17	18	4	23	6
SAAP	0	0	0	3	23	1
Friends/relatives	45	57	61	66	54	53
Improvised dwellings	54	26	21	27	0	40
	100	100	100	100	100	100

Number						
	Southern	Central North	North Eastern	North Western Rural	Lyell	Total
Boarding house	3	11	10	5	3	32
SAAP	0	0	0	4	3	7
Friends/relatives	140	37	34	79	7	297
Improvised dwellings	165	17	12	32	0	226
	308	65	56	120	13	562

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

There were 562 homeless people distributed across rural Tasmania (Table 4.6). In most communities, between 50 and 65 per cent were staying with other households. In these small communities, there is usually no SAAP accommodation and most people who lose their accommodation stay with friends or relatives. There were a handful of people in boarding houses.

In Central North, North Eastern and North Western Rural, between 21 and 27 per cent of the homeless were in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out (Table 4.6). In Southern, 54 per cent of the homeless were in the improvised dwellings category, accounting for 165 people. We think that most of these people were living in improvised dwellings on land that was owned, being purchased or rented. Most households in the primary population reported low incomes and in about half of the households no one was employed.

The local council in Southern knew of 10 sheds where people were living 'out in the bush' and the council was investigating another 10 properties that had come to their attention. Council officials said the municipality 'covered a large area' and it was 'quite possible that could be other people living in sheds or improvised dwellings'. We think that most households were living in rural poverty.

4.5 MARGINAL RESIDENTS OF CARAVAN PARKS

The national report pointed out that boarding houses are more common in capital cities and less common in regional centres and country towns. In these communities, SAAP workers sometimes refer homeless people to local caravan parks if there is no emergency accommodation available. Marginal residents of caravan parks were defined as people who were renting caravans or cabins, living at their usual address, and with no one in the dwelling having full-time employment.

The 2006 Census found that 70 per cent of boarding house residents were in the capital cities and 30 per cent were in regional centres and country towns (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2008, Ch. 7). In contrast, 71 per cent of marginal caravan park dwellers were in regional centres and country towns and 29 per cent were in capital cities. There is a sense in which caravans are used as an alternative to boarding houses outside of the capital cities. SAAP workers sometimes refer people to the local caravan park if there is no emergency accommodation available or if there are no boarding houses. Caravan parks may also house some people who are unable to re-enter the private rental market, on a longer-term basis.

4.7 NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE AND NUMBER OF MARGINAL RESIDENTS OF CARAVAN PARKS

	Hobart	Launceston	Burnie- Devonport	Rural Tasmania	Total*
Number of homeless	1060	490	390	562	2507
Rate per 10 000	53	49	50	57	52
Caravan park residents	26	28	84	24	162
Total	1086	518	474	586	2669
Rate per 10 000	54	52	61	60	56

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

* No geographical information on 5 people.

The issue of whether to include marginal residents of caravan parks as part of the homeless population is particularly important for policy makers in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia, because 93 per cent of marginal residents of caravan parks were in those states.

Table 4.7 shows there were 162 marginal residents of caravan parks in Tasmania, and half (84) were in Burnie-Devonport. Informants on the North Coast knew of caravan parks being used as emergency accommodation, particularly in the off season. However, the number of caravan parks was said to have declined and some caravan parks refused to take homeless people.

For some policy purposes, marginal residents of caravan parks might be thought of as part of the tertiary population. If these residents are included, then the rate of homelessness was 56 per 10 000 in Tasmania, compared with 52 per 10 000 using the ABS definition. The broader definition makes a significant difference in Burnie-Devonport where the rate increases from 50 to 61 per 10 000.

5 INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS

In Tasmania, 95 per cent of people answered the census question: 'Is the person of Aboriginal or Torres Strait islander origin?' and 3.7 per cent identified as Indigenous. However, there was no information on the Indigenous status of the homeless young people staying temporarily with friends or relatives, who were not counted in the census. We use census data on homeless people staying with other households (the 'usual address' question) to estimate how many Indigenous young people were missed by the census.

There is a risk of underestimating Indigenous homelessness, because many Indigenous households make sense of the 'usual address' question within a different cultural frame of reference. When Indigenous people leave home to escape domestic violence or other family problems, they often move in with members of their extended family. In these circumstances, it is not culturally appropriate to record 'no usual address' on census night, because 'home' is understood in a different way. This creates underreporting in this category.

5.1 NUMBER OF INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS HOMELESS PEOPLE AND RATES OF HOMELESSNESS PER 10 000, 2001 AND 2006

	2001			2006		
	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Total*	Non-Indigenous	Indigenous	Total**
Number	2235	151	2415	2281	207	2507
Rate	50	92	52	50	118	53

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2001, 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2001, 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2001, 2006.

* Figures were adjusted for missing data on Indigenous status, except in 29 cases where there was inadequate information to make the adjustment.

** Figures have been adjusted for missing data on Indigenous status, except in 19 cases where there was inadequate information to make the adjustment.

There were 207 homeless Indigenous people in Tasmania on census night 2006 (Table 5.1). The rate was 118 per 10 000 of the population compared with a rate of 92 in 2001. The rate of homelessness for non-Indigenous people was 50 per 10 000, the same as in 2001. Indigenous people were overrepresented in the homeless population in all states and

territories in 2006, but the rate of Indigenous homelessness has increased in Tasmania since 2001.

There were 95 homeless Indigenous people in Hobart (Table 5.2), 40 in Launceston, 39 in Burnie-Devonport, and 33 in rural areas. There were 17 Indigenous people who were marginal residents of caravan parks, mainly in Burnie-Devonport.

5.2 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF INDIGENOUS AND NON-INDIGENOUS HOMELESS PEOPLE, 2006

	Non-Indigenous		Indigenous	
	N	%	N	%
Hobart	955	42	95	46
Launceston	446	20	40	19
Burnie-Devonport	354	15	39	19
Rural	526	23	33	16
	2281	100	207	100

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2006.

6 DISCUSSION

The Australian Government's White Paper on homelessness has proposed two ambitious goals: 'to halve homelessness by 2020' and to provide 'supported accommodation to all rough sleepers who need it', along with interim targets for 2013. The Commonwealth, state and territory governments will work together to achieve the targets specified in the White Paper. This chapter makes some comments on the White Paper's targets, on the basis of the 2006 statistical data on homelessness.

The White Paper highlights three strategies to achieve its goals. The first strategy is 'turning off the tap', which relates to the provision of services focusing on early intervention and prevention (Homelessness Taskforce 2008, Ch. 3). The second strategy is 'improving and expanding services to end homelessness', which focuses on providing services that assist people into 'stable long-term housing, employment and training' or other forms of community participation (Homelessness Taskforce 2008, Ch. 4). The third strategy is 'breaking the cycle', whereby homeless people can 'move quickly through the crisis system to stable housing with the support they need so that homelessness does not reoccur' (Homelessness Taskforce 2008, Ch. 5).

The White Paper was accompanied by a significant financial commitment of \$1.2 billion over five years, with \$800 million allocated for prevention and early intervention services, and a further \$400 million to increase the supply of 'affordable and supported housing for people who would otherwise be homeless'. Since the White Paper, the government has announced a further \$6.6 billion to be spent on the construction of 20 000 homes for public housing, the largest expansion of public housing for many years.

The aim of the government is to reduce the number of homeless people from 105 000 in 2006 to 50 000 by 2020. The White Paper is not a detailed plan, but it does provide a policy framework for the national response to homelessness and foreshadows significant funded initiatives to achieve targeted social goals. However, the international economic environment is now far more problematic than it was prior to 2008, and the global economic recession may create additional pressures that exacerbate homelessness.

6.1 HOMELESS STATISTICS

There are three main sources of statistical data that inform policy. The first is the ABS Census of Population and Housing undertaken every five years. The 2001 Census reported 99 900 homeless people and the 2006 census reported 104 676. At both censuses the rate of homelessness was 53 persons per 10 000 of the population. On census night 2006, 16 375 people were counted in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping rough (primary homelessness), 46 856 people were staying temporarily with other households (secondary homelessness), 19 849 were in SAAP (secondary homelessness), and 21 596 were in boarding houses (tertiary homelessness).

The profile of the homeless population looks different if people are classified on the basis of their housing histories, rather than their accommodation on census night. In a study of 4291 homeless people in Melbourne, Chamberlain, Johnson and Theobald (2007) found that 92 per cent of their sample had moved regularly from one form of temporary accommodation to another. Nearly everyone had stayed with friends or relatives, but 85 per cent had also stayed in boarding houses, 60 per cent had been in SAAP/THM accommodation, and 50 per cent had slept rough. Homeless people show up in particular places on census night, but many of them will be somewhere else a few weeks later.

The second source of data is the National SAAP Data Collection which gathers information on all persons assisted by the SAAP program. The National SAAP Data Collection provides important information on the needs and social characteristics of people who use these services. Between 1 July 2005 and 30 June 2006, 106 500 homeless adults and 54 700 accompanying children were assisted, making a total of 161 200 persons in SAAP (AIHW 2007, p. xi). It would be possible to estimate the annual homeless population if we knew what proportion of homeless people use SAAP services, but we do not have this statistic.

The third source of statistical data is research surveys of different subgroups within the homeless population. These samples are usually drawn from service users. However, findings from this kind of research can be used to make inferences about the homeless population. In 2001, Chamberlain and MacKenzie (2003) contacted all SAAP services in census week and were provided with 812 case studies. The research found that 48 per cent of SAAP clients had been homeless for one year or longer (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2003, p. 42). In a study of 630 SAAP clients, Eardley, Thompson, Cass and Dadich (2008, Ch. 5) found that 65 per cent had been homeless on two or more occasions and one-quarter had received help from SAAP for between one and five years; and in a study of 4291

people, Chamberlain, Johnson and Theobald (2007, p. 25) found that 64 per cent had been homeless for one year or longer. The findings suggest that a significant proportion of the homeless population have long-term housing problems. Making good use of the available statistical data necessarily means making reasoned inferences from the different data sources.

6.2 REDUCING HOMELESSNESS: OVERVIEW

Homelessness is a process including stages of becoming homeless, being homeless and at some point recovering from homelessness. In Australia, thinking about homelessness as a process is well-established and metaphors such as the 'homeless career' (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 1998) and 'homeless pathways' are widely used to refer to these transitions (Clapham 2003; Johnson, Gronda and Coutts 2008). The homeless population consists of diverse groups: single men and women, families with children, and young people on their own. For some people, homelessness is a short-lived experience, while for others homelessness lasts more than one year, and some people experience repeated episodes of homelessness.

People become homeless for diverse reasons. Teenagers typically experience homelessness following a breakdown in their family situation. Some families become homeless as debt mounts and they are evicted from their housing. For other people, it is a breakdown in their conjugal relationship, often involving domestic violence, that results in one partner (usually a woman with children) losing their accommodation. Mental health issues or drug and alcohol abuse may be directly implicated in some people becoming homeless, but other people develop these issues in the homeless population (Chamberlain, Johnson and Theobald 2007).

It is known that some groups are particularly vulnerable to homelessness, such as young people who have been through the care and protection system (Johnson and Chamberlain 2008a). Also, it is known that Indigenous people are more vulnerable to becoming homeless than non-Indigenous Australians.

Reducing the size of the homeless population will require a significant investment in early intervention and applying appropriate intervention models for different subgroups in the population. There will also be a need for improved services to support people who are homeless and follow-up support to ensure that formerly homeless people can maintain their accommodation. Finally, a major investment in affordable housing, including public and community housing, will be needed over the next decade.

6.3 ROUGH SLEEPERS

The White Paper prioritises reducing the number of people sleeping rough and ‘offering supported accommodation to all rough sleepers who need it’ (Homelessness Taskforce 2008, p. 17). This is a commendable priority, but three points need to be borne in mind.

First, providing people with emergency accommodation can be justified on both moral and practical grounds, but moving rough sleepers into supported accommodation will not reduce the overall number of homeless people.

Second, it is important to recognise that most people do not sleep rough on a permanent basis. Chamberlain, Johnson and Theobald (2007) found that only two per cent of their sample was consistently without shelter, but 49 per cent of the sample had slept rough occasionally.

Third, the census identified 16 375 people in the ‘improvised dwellings’ category. However, this category includes a wide range of situations from sleeping in a park and sheltering in a derelict building, to living in a shed or garage of some kind. There is no simple way of disaggregating the category, but in 2006 we conducted further research. We examined census data, then we held many discussions with building inspectors, town planners and service providers across the country. This provided the basis for estimating the number of persons in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of persons sleeping rough (for example, in public places, derelict buildings, cars and tents).

In Chapter 2, we estimated that in the capital cities about 75 per cent of households in the ‘primary homeless’ category were sleeping rough. However, in regional Australia the situation was different. About 60 per cent of households in this category were living in sheds, garages or shacks, most of which were owned or being purchased. Their living arrangements were below the community standard used to define homelessness, and in the main they were low-income households, but they were not transient and some were employed in local communities.

People sleeping rough or squatting in derelict buildings were more likely to be on their own, whereas people in improvised dwellings were more likely to be in families or group households. Overall, we estimate about 9900 persons in improvised dwellings across the country and about 6500 rough sleepers, although the latter group was undercounted.

6.4 YOUNG PEOPLE

Youth homelessness has been a major policy focus since the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission's 1989 report, *Our Homeless Children*, and in 2008 there was a National Youth Commission report, *Australia's Homeless Youth*. Youth refers to young people aged 12 to 24. However, a distinction is often drawn between teenagers aged 12 to 18 and young adults aged 19 to 24.

There have been important initiatives to assist homeless teenagers and their families. The establishment of the Reconnect program in 1999 was a major early intervention initiative by the Australian Government to reduce youth homelessness. Reconnect was implemented in phases and was not fully operational until 2003. Twenty-nine services were funded in December 1999 (DFaCS 2003, p. 22). By 2003, there were 98 Reconnect services across the country. The most recent evaluation of Reconnect (DFaCS 2003, p. 8) found that the program had achieved positive outcomes for young people and their families.

In addition, several states implemented new programs such as the Youth Support Coordinators Program in Queensland and the Family Reconciliation and Mediation Program in Victoria. Some SAAP youth agencies also undertake early intervention with recently homeless young people. Since the late 1990s, several state and territory governments have expended additional funds to increase the number of welfare staff in schools and to improve assistance to young people and families in crisis.

6.1 CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION

	2001	2006	% change
Families with children	22 944	26 790	+16.8
Youth aged 12 to 18 (alone)	22 600	17 891	-20.8
Adults (singles and couples)	54 356	59 995	+10.4
	99 900	104 676	+4.8

Source: Census of Population and Housing 2001, 2006; SAAP Client Collection 2001, 2006; National Census of Homeless School Students 2001, 2006.

Table 6.1 shows that the number of homeless youth aged 12 to 18 decreased from 22 600 in 2001 to 17 891 in 2006, a decrease of 20.8 per cent. This is compelling evidence that these early intervention initiatives have been effective. There are currently 98 Reconnect services across the country, but it has been estimated that 50 per cent of communities do not have a Reconnect program (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2004, p. 41–43). At any point in time, there are 15 000 students across the country at risk of becoming homeless

(Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2004, p. 42). Youth homelessness could be further reduced by expanding Reconnect to have national coverage.

In a study of 1642 homeless adults and young adults, Johnson and Chamberlain (2008a) found that 42 per cent of their sample had been in the state care and protection system. Young people who have been in state care are at greater risk of becoming homeless than most teenagers, and they are at much greater risk of making the transition from youth to adult homelessness. Targeted intervention and a reformed care and protection system are important components of an effective early intervention strategy for youth. In addition, such initiatives will have a flow-on effect by reducing the number of homeless teenagers moving into the adult homeless population.

6.5 FAMILIES

Another group for whom early intervention is a crucial issue is families. The number of persons in family households on census night increased from 22 944 in 2001 to 26 790 in 2006, an increase of 16.8 per cent (Table 6.1). Families make up 28 per cent of SAAP users (AIHW 2007, p. 37). In 2005–06, the number of children accompanying parents in SAAP was 54 700 (AIHW 2007, p. 15).

Most commonly, families become homeless because of a housing crisis or domestic violence. Adults in families experiencing a housing crisis are typically unemployed or outside of the labour force. These families are usually poor and often have accumulated debts. In most cases, the family is facing eviction because of rent arrears.

Early intervention with families experiencing a housing crisis involves providing families with assistance before they lose their accommodation, including family counselling to resolve relationship difficulties, financial advice, some funds to settle debts, and assistance with applications for public housing. There is a small national program providing this kind of response. In 2001, a pilot program of eight services known as the Family Homelessness Prevention Project (FHPP) was launched with a single service in each jurisdiction. From 1 July 2004, the program continued under a new name as the Household Organisational Management Expenses (HOME) Advice Program.

An evaluation of the HOME program found that if families at risk of homelessness were reached with assistance before losing their accommodation, 86 per cent of those families remained in adequate housing or improved their housing situation during the period of support (MacKenzie, Desmond and Steen 2007). The evaluation highlighted two key success factors: the availability of brokerage funds and a capacity to work through issues on a needs basis. The effects of this assistance were

found to be sustainable for a majority of families in the 12 months after support.

The HOME Advice program was a small-scale initiative and had only a small impact on the overall population of at-risk families. Family homelessness could be reduced by expanding the HOME project to have national coverage. Preliminary estimates indicate the need for between 100 and 250 services.

Some families become homeless as a result of family breakdown involving domestic violence. There has been a considerable investment in changing community attitudes towards domestic violence (Carrington and Phillips 2006), but it is not clear to what extent early intervention strategies have been implemented to assist women experiencing domestic violence. One impediment to implementing early intervention is that many women do not request assistance until they have left the family home.

One form of early intervention is family counselling to help couples work through their relationship issues, and another form of intervention is to remove the perpetrator of violence from the family home. Otherwise, 'early intervention' for victims of domestic violence means assisting them to move quickly to alternative, secure accommodation. The number of people using these services may not decrease, but if their time spent in homelessness services is minimised, then the number of families in the point-in-time census count will decrease over time. The current lack of affordable housing affects homeless families escaping domestic violence, by prolonging their homelessness and increasing the number of homeless people on census night.

6.6 ADULTS WITHOUT CHILDREN

There were 59 995 homeless adults without children on census night, up from 54 356 in 2001, an increase of 10.4 per cent (Table 6.1). Two-thirds of these adults were men and one-third were women. Adults without children are the largest group of service users and many have been homeless for extended periods of time or have moved in and out of homelessness. In general, early intervention strategies are not the issue for single adults with a history of homelessness, although over time early intervention for teenagers will stem the flow into the adult homeless population. The lack of affordable and appropriate housing is a major issue for this group.

Some 21 000 people live in boarding houses, and these properties are often in poor condition with issues of health and safety for the residents. Greater regulation to improve the living conditions in boarding houses and legislation to improve security of tenure would be stop-gap measures,

but most people in boarding houses want affordable self-contained accommodation.

About one-quarter of the adults without children were aged 55 or older (15 000 people). An appropriate aged-care response could provide more adequate long-term accommodation for people who currently reside in boarding houses or take up places in the homelessness service system.

A significant proportion of the people with a long-term housing problem have substance abuse issues and/or mental health issues, which complicates their exit from homelessness (Johnson and Chamberlain 2008b). Most of the adults who were homeless on census night needed assistance to find appropriate, affordable housing, and long-term support to maintain that accommodation.

The main policy imperatives for this group are the creation of sufficient affordable housing stock, continuing support for individuals with complex housing needs, and sufficient levels of support to assist people who have experienced long-term homelessness to live in the community.

6.7 CONCLUSION

The White Paper proposes a long-term effort to halve homelessness by 2020. Achieving the right mix of interventions is one challenge. About 50 per cent of the homeless population could be assisted directly by the early intervention measures discussed above. The other component of a balanced response is the need for a steep increase in the stock of affordable housing, combined with policies that guarantee access for the most disadvantaged, and sufficient long-term, case-managed support to prevent homelessness reoccurring. At this point, it is unclear whether sufficient resources have been deployed to fund the programs that are needed.

A second challenge is to recognise that it will take several years before an assessment can be made about the effectiveness of the White Paper's initiatives. It takes time to put new services in place and for those services to have their full impact. It will also take time to increase the supply of affordable housing, and other low-income people will be competing for the new housing stock.

The White Paper sets out interim targets for 2013, including an overall reduction in homelessness of 21 000 people (Homelessness Taskforce 2008, p. 18). In 2013, homeless figures from the 2011 census will become available, but it is unlikely that the impact from the new initiatives will be apparent in 2011. The findings from the 2016 census will be of more relevance for assessing whether the White Paper's targets have been achieved.

REFERENCES

ABS: see Australian Bureau of Statistics.

AIHW: see Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006a) *2006 Year Book Australia*,
Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue No. 1301.0.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006b) *2006 Census Dictionary*,
Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue No. 2901.0.

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006c) *Statistical Geography Volume 1 –
Australian Standard Geographical Classification*, Canberra:
Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue No. 1216.0.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2007) *Homeless People
in SAAP: SAAP National Data Collection Annual Report
2005–06*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare,
Catalogue No. HOU 156.

Badcock, B and Beer, A (2000) *Home Truths: Property Ownership
and Housing Wealth in Australia*, Carlton South: Melbourne
University Press.

Carrington, K and Phillips, J (2006) *Domestic Violence in Australia: an
Overview of the Issues*, viewed 4 August 2008, <http://www.aph.gov.au/library/intguide/SP/Dom_Violence.htm>.

Chamberlain, C, Johnson, G and Theobald, J (2007) *Homelessness
in Melbourne*, RMIT Publishing, Informit E-Library.

Chamberlain, C and MacKenzie, D (1992) 'Understanding Contemporary
Homelessness: Issues of Definition and Meaning',
Australian Journal of Social Issues, 27(4), 274–297.

Chamberlain, C and MacKenzie, D (1998) *Youth Homelessness:
Early Intervention and Prevention*, Sydney: Australian Centre
for Equity through Education.

- Chamberlain, C and MacKenzie, D (2003) *Counting the Homeless 2001*, Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue No. 2050.0.
- Chamberlain, C and MacKenzie, D. (2004) *Youth Homelessness: Four Policy Proposals*, Melbourne: Australian Housing and Research Institute.
- Chamberlain, C and MacKenzie, D. (2008) *Counting the Homeless 2006*, Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue No. 2050.0.
- Clapham, D (2003) 'Pathways Approaches to Homeless Research', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 13, 119–127.
- De Hoog, J (1972) *Skid Row Dossier*, Melbourne: Sun Books.
- Department of Family and Community Services (2003) *I'm Looking at the Future: Evaluation Report of Reconnect*, Canberra: DFACS.
- DFACS: see Department of Family and Community Services.
- Eardley, T, Thompson, D, Cass, B and Dadich, A (2008) *Measuring the Impact of SAAP-funded Homelessness Services on Client Self-reliance*, Canberra: SAAP National Coordination and Development Committee, FaHCSIA.
- Giovanetti, A, Reid, J, Murdoch, F and Edwards, S (2007) 'Dynamics of Homelessness' in Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, *Australia's Welfare 2007*, Canberra: AIHW, Catalogue No. AUS 93.
- Hayward, D (1992) *Reconstructing a Dream: An Analysis of Home Ownership in Australia*, Ph.D thesis, Monash University (unpublished).
- Homelessness Taskforce (2008) *The Road Home: A National Approach to Reducing Homelessness*, Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (1989) *Our Homeless Children*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Johnson, G and Chamberlain, C (2008a) 'From Youth to Adult Homelessness', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 43(4), 563–582.

- Johnson, G and Chamberlain, C (2008b) 'Homelessness and Substance Abuse: Which Comes First?' *Australian Social Work*, 61(4), 342–356.
- Johnson, G, Gronda, H and Coutts, S (2008) *On the Outside: Pathways in and out of Homelessness*, Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing.
- Jordan, A (1973) *Inner City Homeless Men in Melbourne*, MA thesis, La Trobe University.
- Jordan, A (1994) *Going Bad: Homeless Men in an Australian City*, Melbourne: Council to Homeless Persons, Victoria.
- Kemeny, J (1983) *The Great Australian Nightmare*, Melbourne: Georgian House.
- MacKenzie, D and Chamberlain, C (2008) *Youth Homelessness in Australia 2006*, Melbourne: Counting the Homeless 2006 project.
- MacKenzie, D, Desmond, K and Steen, A (2007) Household Organisational Management Expenses (HOME) Advice Program Evaluation Report 2007, Canberra: Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.
- National Youth Commission (2008) *Australia's Homeless Youth*, Melbourne: National Youth Commission.
- Reid, J, Griffin, J and Murdoch, F (2005), 'Services for People Experiencing Homelessness' in Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, *Australia's Welfare 2005*, Canberra: AIHW, Catalogue No. AUS 65.
- Townsend, P (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Watson, S (with Austerberry, H) (1986) *Housing and Homelessness: A Feminist Perspective*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Appendix 1: Number of homeless people in Tasmania by statistical division and subdivision, 2006

	Group 1 Imp. dwell	Group 2 Friends	Group 3 Board Hse	Group 4 SAAP	Total	Usual Res. Population	Rate per 10 000	Group 5 Caravan	Total (incl. caravan)	Rate (incl. caravan)
Greater Hobart	125	480	96	359	1060	200 523	53	26	1086	54
Southern	165	140	3	0	308	34 929	88	14	322	92
Northern	42	303	117	149	611	133 932	46	38	649	48
Greater Launceston	13	232	96	149	490	99 674	49	28	518	52
Central North	17	37	11	0	65	20 328	32	5	70	34
North Eastern	12	34	10	0	56	13 930	40	5	61	44
Mersey-Lyell	53	320	36	114	523	106 131	49	84	607	57
Burnie-Devonport	21	234	28	107	390	77 409	50	84	474	61
North Western Rural	32	79	5	4	120	23 717	51	0	120	51
Lyell	0	7	3	3	13	5005	26	0	13	26
Missing data	0	5	0	0	5	965		0	5	
Total	385	1248	252	622	2507	476 480	53	162	2669	56

SLAs

	Group 1 Imp. dwell	Group 2 Friends	Group 3 Board Hse	Group 4 SAAP	Total	Usual Res. Population	Rate per 10 000	Group 5 Caravan	Total (incl. caravan)	Rate (incl. caravan)
Hobart Inner	19	5	19	0	43	453	949	0	43	949
Hobart Remainder	4	118	67	242	431	47 244	91	0	431	91
Launceston Inner	0	0	3	0	3	254	118	0	3	118
Launceston Part B	10	140	86	149	387	59 191	65	10	397	67
Burnie Part A	0	58	18	19	95	16 997	56	3	98	58
Devonport	5	67	0	79	151	24 015	63	35	186	77

Appendix 2: Estimated number of Indigenous and non-Indigenous homeless people in Tasmania by statistical division and subdivision, 2006*

		Group 1 Imp. dwell	Group 2 Friends	Group 3 Board Hse	Group 4 SAAP	Total	Usual Res Pop	Rate per 10 000	Group 5 Caravan	Total (incl. caravan)	Rate (incl. caravan)
Greater Hobart	Non-Indig	114	444	92	305	955	194 477	49	26	981	50
	Indig	11	36	4	44	95	6046	157	0	95	157
Southern	Non-Indig	158	135	3	0	296	32 764	90	11	307	94
	Indig	7	5	0	0	12	2165	55	3	15	69
Northern	Non-Indig	42	298	116	111	567	130 275	44	33	600	46
	Indig	0	5	1	34	40	3657	109	0	40	109
Greater Launceston	Non-Indig	13	227	95	111	446	97 023	46	28	474	49
	Indig	0	5	1	34	40	2651	151	0	40	151
Central North	Non-Indig	17	37	11	0	65	19 841	33	0	65	33
	Indig	0	0	0	0	0	487	0	0	0	0
North Eastern	Non-Indig	12	34	10	0	56	13 411	42	5	61	45
	Indig	0	0	0	0	0	519	0	0	0	0
Mersey-Lyell	Non-Indig	46	289	30	98	463	100 459	46	70	533	53
	Indig	7	31	6	16	60	5672	107	14	74	130
Burnie-Devonport	Non-Indig	21	214	25	94	354	73 491	48	70	424	58
	Indig	0	20	3	16	39	3918	100	14	53	135
North Western Rural	Non-Indig	25	68	2	0	95	22 323	43	0	95	43
	Indig	7	11	3	0	21	1394	151	0	21	151
Lyell	Non-Indig	0	7	3	4	14	4645	30	0	14	30
	Indig	0	0	0	0	0	360	0	0	0	0
Total	Non-Indig	360	1166	241	514	2281	457 975	50	140	2421	53
	Indig	25	77	11	94	207	17 540	118	17	224	128
Missing data		0	5	0	14	19	965		5	24	
Total		385	1248	252	622	2507	476 480	53	162	2669	56

* Figures have been adjusted for missing data on Indigenous status, except in 19 cases where there was inadequate information to make the adjustment.

Appendix 3: Percentage of homeless people by statistical division and subdivision, 2006

	Number	Percentage
Greater Hobart	1060	42.3
Southern	308	12.3
Northern	611	24.4
Greater Launceston	490	19.6
Central North	65	2.6
North Eastern	56	2.2
Mersey-Lyell	523	20.8
Burnie-Devonport	390	15.6
North Western Rural	120	4.8
Lyell	13	0.5
Missing data	5	0.2
Total	2507	100.00
Selected SLAs	Number	Percentage
Hobart Inner	43	1.7
Hobart Remainder	431	17.2
Launceston Inner	3	0.1
Launceston Part B	387	15.4
Burnie Part A	95	3.8
Devonport	151	6.0

Appendix 4: Percentage of homeless people and marginal caravan park residents by statistical division and subdivision, 2006

	Number	Percentage
Greater Hobart	1086	40.7
Southern	322	12.1
Northern	649	24.3
Greater Launceston	518	19.4
Central North	70	2.6
North Eastern	61	2.3
Mersey-Lyell	607	22.7
Burnie-Devonport	474	17.7
North Western Rural	120	4.5
Lyell	13	0.5
Missing data	5	0.2
Total	2669	100.00
Selected SLAs	Number	Percentage
Hobart Inner	43	1.6
Hobart Remainder	431	16.1
Launceston Inner	3	0.1
Launceston Part B	397	14.9
Burnie Part A	98	3.7
Devonport	186	7.0